

Remarks:

Claim 1-19 remain for consideration in this application. Claims 8, 12, 14, and 17 have been amended. The limitation of the cylinder lock comprising a plurality of spring-biased cylindrical pin tumblers has been added to claims 8, 14, and 17. Claim 12 has been amended to recite the limitations that the locking bar presents a protruding portion extending transversely from the longitudinal axis of the locking bar, and that the locking bar protruding portion is engaged by the key blade's side margin protruding surface when the key is inserted into the keyway of the cylinder lock. Claim 12 also has been amended to include the limitations that neither the key blade nor the protruding surface extend beyond the outer side margins of the key bow. Support for these amendments is set forth in the attached Statement of Status and Support for Claims.

Turning now to the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-19 and is being based upon a defective reissue declaration. Applicant has enclosed a new declaration setting forth that claim 8 as originally patented was anticipated by German Patent Publication 2,828,343 and that Applicant has amended claim 8 to recite the limitation of a locking bar protruding portion extending transversely from the longitudinal axis of the locking bar which is engaged by a key protruding surface when the key is inserted in the keyway of the cylinder lock. Applicant has also expressly stated that this limitation narrows the scope of claim 8. In view of the newly submitted reissue declaration, Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 8, 9, 14, 15, and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Spain. As noted above, Applicant has amended independent claims 8, 14, and 17 to recite that the cylinder lock comprises a plurality of spring-biased cylindrical pin tumblers. The cylinder lock

of Spain does not employ spring-biased cylindrical pin tumblers as presently claimed. Instead, Spain teaches a lock comprising a plurality of rotary tumblers 24. Thus, Spain does not anticipate claims 8, 14, 17 and all claims which depend therefrom. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 14, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by DE '374. Again, Applicant has amended independent claims 8 and 14 to recite that the cylinder lock comprises a plurality of spring-biased cylindrical pin tumblers. DE '374 does not teach the use of spring-biased cylindrical pin tumblers. Structures 48 of Figs. 22, 23, 24, and 25 are not spring-biased tumblers and appear to be an arrangement of blocking discs. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by FR '953. Claim 12 has been amended to recite that the locking bar presents a protruding portion extending transversely from the longitudinal axis of the locking bar. Clearly, the locking bar 15 of FR '953 does not present a protruding portion as presently claimed. Furthermore, claim 12 also recites that the locking bar includes a hollow chamber formed therein with the spring being at least partially received in the chamber. As demonstrated in Figs. 1 and 2 of FR '953, locking bar 15 does not even contact spring 17. Instead, spring 17 abuts pin 16. Therefore, FR '953 does not anticipate claim 12. Claim 14 recites the limitation that the locking bar presents a pair of sidewall sections substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis of the locking bar. Applicant submits that locking bar 15 of FR '953 does not meet this limitation. Locking bar 15, shown in phantom in Figs. 3 and 4, clearly presents a circular cross-sectional profile thus indicating that locking bar 15 is cylindrical. Because of its

cylindrical configuration it is not possible for locking bar 15 to present a pair of sidewall sections as presently claimed. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 14 and 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DE '398. Independent claims 14 and 17 have been amended to recite that the cylinder lock comprises a plurality of spring-biased cylindrical pin tumblers. DE '398 is similar to reference DE '374 discussed above in that it does not teach a plurality of spring-biased cylindrical pin tumblers as presently claimed. Furthermore, with respect to claim 14, DE '398 does not teach a locking bar presenting a pair of sidewall sections substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis of the locking bar. As shown in Fig. 18, locking bar 12 presents a circular cross-sectional profile indicating that it is substantially cylindrical. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by DE '343. As previously noted above, claim 14 includes the limitation that the secondary locking bar presents a pair of sidewall sections substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis of the locking bar. Lock bar 12 of DE '343 presents a circular cross-sectional profile similar to lock bar 12 in DE '398 discussed above. As the sidewall section limitation of claim 14 is not taught by DE '343, Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 12 was further rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spain, DE '374, DE '343, or DE '398 in view of Ku et al. It is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to modify the lock bars of each of the primary references with "lock bar" 15 of Ku et al. Applicant has amended claim 12 to further recite that the lock bar presents a protruding portion which is engaged by the key blade's protruding surface, and neither the key blade nor the protruding

surface extend beyond the bow outer side margin. In view of the amendments to claim 12, Applicant submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness does not exist as the primary references when combined with Ku et al. do not teach all of the claimed limitations.

The Spain reference does not teach the limitation that the key blade does not extend beyond the bow outer side margins. As shown in Figs. 2 and 3, the key blade extends well outside the outer side margins of the bow. The same can be said for the key blades of DE '398 and DE '374. Figs. 2-4, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17-20 and 22 of DE '398 all depict keys having round key blades or key blades having side wall sections which very widely protrude. Figs. 1-5, 13-21, and 23-29 of DE '374 also depict keys having round key blades or key blades with side wall sections which protrude beyond the bow outer side margins.

DE '343 teaches a key blade having protruding surfaces which extend beyond the bow outer side margins. This is most clearly seen in Fig. 2 where the protruding surface (indicated at reference numeral 32) extends beyond the bow outer side margins (surface proximate reference numeral 28). This interpretation is also supported by the cross-sectional view of Fig 4. In this figure, surface 32 extends beyond the width of key bow 28.

Ku et al. does not overcome the shortcomings of the primary references discussed above. As shown in Fig. 4, Ku et al. clearly teach a key having a key blade that extends beyond the bow outer side margins. The key blade of Ku et al. also does not teach side margins including a protruding surface extending therefrom as required by claim 12. In view of the foregoing, Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-7, 10, 11, 13, and 16 were allowed by the Examiner.

In view of the forgoing a Notice of Allowance appears to be in order and such is courteously solicited.

Any additional fee which is due in connection with this amendment should be applied against our Deposit Account No. 19-0522.

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Thomas B. Luebbering, Reg. No. 37,874  
HOVEY WILLIAMS LLP  
2405 Grand Boulevard, Suite 400  
Kansas City, Missouri 64108  
816/474-9050

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT(S)